

Postal Regulatory Commission for their opinions on the Postmaster General's statutory authority for this ill-advised action.

Mr. Speaker, Representative GRAVES and I have introduced a bipartisan resolution urging the Postal Service to preserve 6-day delivery. We would welcome our colleagues in joining us to highlight congressional intent that Saturday service is vital to our neighborhoods and small businesses and to the vitality of our communities. I urge my colleagues to take a closer look.

THE DRONES ARE COMING, PAGE II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the domestic use of drones is on the way. There will be more eyes in the sky looking over America.

According to the FAA, by 2015, it will allow the use of drones nationwide, and by 2030, 30,000 drones will be cruising American skies—looking, observing, filming, and hovering over America. They will come whether we like it or not. We will not know where they are or what they're looking at or what their purpose is, whether it's permitted or not permitted, whether it's lawful or unlawful, and we really won't know who is flying those drones.

Sometimes drones are good. We can thank drones for helping us track terrorists overseas and for helping us catch outlaws on the border. Legitimate uses by government and private citizens do occur, but a nosy neighbor or a Big Brother government does not have the right to look into a window without legitimate cause or, in the case of government, probable cause.

Mr. Speaker, drones are easy to find. I learned from a simple Google search that you can buy a drone on eBay or at your local Radio Shack. It's very easy. And as technology changes, Congress has the responsibility to be proactive and to protect the Fourth Amendment right of all citizens. The Fourth Amendment states:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.

It doesn't take a constitutional law professor to see why legislation is needed to protect the rights of the American people. The right of a reasonable expectation of privacy is a constitutional right. Any form of snooping or spying, surveillance or eavesdropping goes against the rights that are outlined in the Constitution.

Today, I will reintroduce the Preserving American Privacy Act because it's time for Congress to be proactive in protecting the rights of civilians from the private use and government use of drones. This legislation balances individual constitutional rights with legitimate government activity and the private use of drones. We don't

have time to wait until 2030 when there are 30,000 drones in the sky.

This bill sets clear guidelines, protects individual privacy and informs peace officers so they will know what they can do and what they cannot do under the law. Nobody should be able to use drones for whatever purpose they want. This bill will make it clear for what purpose law enforcement and citizens and businesses can use drones.

There will be limits on the government use of drones so that the surveillance of individuals or their property is only permitted or conducted when there is a warrant. This applies to State, Federal, and local jurisdictions, but there are exceptions. Law enforcement could use a drone for fire and rescue, to monitor droughts and to assess flood damage or to chase a fleeing criminal. And of course, the exceptions, called exigent circumstances, which are already in our law, will apply.

This bill includes a clear statement so that it does not prevent the use of drones for border security. The bill also sets guidelines for the private use of drones.

The bottom line of the bill is simple: nobody should be spying on another unless they have the legal authority to do so. The decision should not be left up to unelected bureaucrats to decide the use of drones, so Congress has the obligation to set guidelines, to secure the right of privacy and to protect citizens from unlawful drone searches. Just because the government has the technology to look into somebody's yard doesn't give it the constitutional right to do so.

And that's just the way it is.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, in a few short weeks, we face automatic across-the-board spending cuts. If allowed, they could not only stall our economic recovery; these cuts will immediately threaten the future of our children and grandchildren. If we allow sequestration to take place, we threaten to kick 70,000 of our children off of the Head Start program. If we allow sequestration to take place, 10,000 American teachers will lose their jobs. We threaten the very future of our children and grandchildren. This is irresponsible.

In the spirit of their future, the children from Mrs. Gibson's third-grade class at Foulks Ranch Elementary School in Elk Grove, California, wanted me to deliver a message to Congress. They are five simple tips: They want Congress to be responsible. They want Congress to be respectful. They want Congress to be kind. They want Congress to be accountable. Mr. Speaker, the third-graders from Mrs. Gibson's class want Congress to make good choices.

Allowing sequestration to take place is a bad choice. If the third-graders can figure it out, I certainly hope we in Congress can as well. Let's do what they advise. Let's be responsible and let's make good choices.

□ 1040

PUERTO RICO MEDICARE PART B EQUITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today I'm introducing a modified version of bipartisan legislation I introduced last Congress. The bill would amend a provision in Federal law that applies only to Puerto Rico and that has harmed thousands of Medicare beneficiaries on the island. My legislation would eliminate this problem for future beneficiaries and provide appropriate financial relief to current beneficiaries who have been adversely affected. Senator SCHUMER is introducing a companion bill, and I want to thank him for his support on this issue.

Most individuals become eligible to enroll in Medicare part A, which covers inpatient hospital care, when they turn 65. In every State and territory except Puerto Rico, individuals enrolled in part A are automatically enrolled in part B, which covers doctors' services and outpatient hospital care and requires the payment of a monthly premium. Individuals can opt out of part B if they don't want it. In Puerto Rico, by contrast, individuals enrolled in part A are not automatically enrolled in part B but, rather, must opt in to receive this coverage.

The problem with the opt-in requirement is that the law requires individuals to elect part B coverage within a 7-month initial enrollment period or to pay a penalty to the Federal Government. The penalty is substantial—a 10 percent increase in the monthly part B premium for every year of delayed enrollment. It is also permanent, lasting as long as the individual has part B, which can be decades.

Over the years, the responsible Federal agencies have done a poor job informing beneficiaries in Puerto Rico about the opt-in requirement and the consequences of late enrollment. Therefore, many of my constituents fail to realize they lack Part B until they get sick and need to visit a doctor, by which point significant time may have elapsed. To illustrate the repercussions, consider the standard Medicare Part B monthly premium of \$105. An individual who enrolls 2 years late must pay a 20 percent surcharge—an additional \$21 per month. Over 1 year, that is \$252. Over 20 years, it is \$5,000.

The combination of the opt-in requirement and inadequate beneficiary education in Puerto Rico has led to consequences that are both severe and